AN

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	10/735,479	JAMES, C. PAT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Demetrius R. Pretlow	2863
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS. This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.		
1. This communication is responsive to <u>amendment filed August 29, 2005</u> .		
2.  The allowed claim(s) is/are 2,3,5-7,19,21-35.		
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some* c) None of the:		
Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the		
International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* Certified copies not received:		
Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.  THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.		
4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.		
5. X CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.		
(a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached		
1) 🗍 hereto or 2) 🗍 to Paper No./Mail Date		
(b) ⊠ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date		
Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.		
·		•
	·	
		·
Attachment(s)	5 17 11 11 11 11	(DTO 450)
1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		atent Application (PTO-152)
2. Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	6. ☐ Interview Summary Paper No./Mail Dat	
3. 🗵 Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No./Mail Date 9/19/05		nent/Comment
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit	8. 🛛 Examiner's Stateme	nt of Reasons for Allowance
of Biological Material	9.	

Art Unit: 2863

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Drawings**

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "170" has been used to designate both remote client and dc plant and reference US 2004/102872 does not correspond to Schick et al. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Examiner never received corrected drawings indicated in amendment filed August 29, 2005.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed September 19, 2005 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the applicants statement regarding client server based software application and dial up connection for retrieving backup generator data does not have a date. It has been placed in the

application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

## **EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT**

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Charles Griggers on November 22, 2002.

The application has been amended as follows:

In claim 2, line 1, delete "DC".

In claim 5, line 1, delete "DC".

In claim 19, line 10, after "with", change "a" to "said at least one ".

In claim 29, line 2, delete "DC".

In claim 29, line 3, change "the' to "a".

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2,3,5-7,9,11-19,21-35 are allowed.

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 2,3 and 7 is the inclusion of the limitations of an a data gathering unit operable to gather a voltage and a current reading from any of at least one rectifier associated with the DC plant. It is these limitations found in each of the claims, as they are **claimed in the combination**, that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record which makes these claims allowable over the prior art.

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 5-6 is the inclusion of the limitations of an testing logic operable to receive feedback from the user and simulate a commercial power failure at a site associated with the AC and DC plants. It is these limitations found in each of the claims, as they are **claimed in the combination**, that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record which makes these claims allowable over the prior art.

The primary reason for the allowance of claim 9 is the inclusion of the limitations of an wherein the alarm logic is operable to signal a minor alarm responsive to a portion of the periodically updated information being outside initial acceptable data points, and operable to signal a major alarm responsive to a portion of the periodically updated information being outside final acceptable data points. It is these limitations found in each of the claims, as they are **claimed in the combination**, that has not been found,

taught or suggested by the prior art of record which makes these claims allowable over the prior art.

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 19, 11-18 is the inclusion of the limitations of an simulation logic operable to simulate a power failure at a site associated with a DC plant. It is these limitations found in each of the claims, as they are claimed in the combination, that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record which makes these claims allowable over the prior art.

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 28, 21-27 is the inclusion of the method steps of simulating a power failure at a site associated with the DC plant; and monitoring the DC plant for operating conditions during the power failure. It is these steps found in each of the claims, as it is **claimed in the combination**, that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record which makes these claims allowable over the prior art.

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 29-35 is the inclusion of the method step of simulating a power failure at a site associated with the DC plant; It is this step found in each of the claims, as it is **claimed in the combination**, that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record which makes these claims allowable over the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 10/735,479 Page 6

Art Unit: 2863

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Demetrius R. Pretlow whose telephone number is (571) 272-2278. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on (571) 272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Demetrius R. Pretlow

Denut Presto 11122105

Patent Examiner

BRYAN BUI PRIMARY EXAMINER .